MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM STAY (NON-BANKRUPTCY FORUM)

NIEVES DARLING & MAH, INC.

HUNT ORTMANN PALFFY

1

2

8

9

10

11

301 NORTH LAKE AVENUE, 7^{TH} FLOOR PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101-1807 (626) 440-5200 • Fax (626) 796-0107 12 13 14 15

> 20 21

22

19

23 24

26

25

28

27

Moyant Reliable Design and Construction Inc. ("Reliable") hereby submits its brief in response to the opposition (the "Opposition") filed by Hue Chau, the debtor herein ("Chau" or the "Debtor"), to Movant's Motion for Relief form Stay (the "Motion")¹, and respectfully states as follows.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Debtor's motive in filing this bankruptcy case is quite transparent. Over the past nineteen months the Debtor has done everything in his power to obstruct and delay the inevitable consequences of the State Arbitration Action. Having run out of options, the Debtor filed for bankruptcy just a few days prior to the deadline for him to respond to Reliable's motion for attorney's fees, costs, and interest. In his Opposition, the Debtor submitted a declaration in which he admits that he is unhappy with the results of the State Arbitration Action. He claims that the Arbitrator was biased against him, and that this is why he needs the bankruptcy court to determine the issue of attorney's fees, costs, and interest. Mr. Chau has presented this court with **no** evidence, admissible or otherwise, of any bias on the part of the Arbitrator. The simple fact is that after listening to six days of testimony, and weighing all the available evidence, the Arbitrator decided in Reliable's favor on most, but by no means all, of the issues. As proof of this, Reliable refers the Court to the fact that the Arbitrator ruled in the Debtor's favor with respect to Reliable's claim for damages due to delay. See Motion, Exh. D at 12:20-13:20. That decision reduced Reliable's damages by \$70,000. A biased finder of fact would not have ruled in that manner.

The Opposition fails to address the majority of the points raised in the Motion. As stated above, the Debtor does not deny that he filed for bankruptcy in an attempt to frustrate the State Arbitration Action and to forum shop for a more favorable venue. Indeed, the Debtor submitted a declaration that effectively claimed that this was precisely his aim. A judicial admission of this sort is prima facie evidence of bad faith. Furthermore, the Debtor does not deny that he has misinformed the Court by failing to list Reliable's mechanic's lien in his schedules. He does not

690244.1 JJ 3841.002

All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Motion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

deny that he directed his non-bankruptcy counsel to threaten and harass Reliable into removing its mechanic's lien. Finally, he does not deny engaging in any of the dilatory and obstructive tactics that Reliable listed in its Motion.

The only point the Debtor takes issue with is Reliable's references to the property located at 14146 Benbow Street, Baldwin Park, CA 91706. Here, the Debtor states that he made a mistake in his schedules, and that this is not evidence of bad faith. He also claims that there is no official address of 14146 Benbow Street, Baldwin Park, CA 91706. But if this last point is true, then one must ask why the Benbow Street address is listed as the Debtor's residential address on the first page of the bankruptcy petition. Regardless, Movant's mechanic's lien clearly states that it applies to Assessor Parcel Number 8543-012-022. A review of the Debtor's revised schedule A, which still omits Movant's mechanic's lien, lists the same parcel number. Thus, Movant's mechanic's lien applies to the property regardless of which street address the Debtor wishes to use.

II. THE BANKRUPTCY CASE WAS FILED IN BAD FAITH.

By his declaration, the Debtor admits that he filed for bankruptcy so that a different judge could rule on the issue of attorney's fees, costs, and interest. Bad faith is grounds for relief from the automatic stay to permit a pending state court action to proceed. See, e.g., In re Kissinger, 72 F.3d 107, 109 (9th Cir. 1995) (finding bad faith where a debtor filed for bankruptcy immediately before state trial was to go to jury). Courts have made similar findings in the Chapter 13 context. For example, in *In re Chinichian*, 784 F.2d 1440 (9th Cir. 1986), the Ninth Circuit held that a relevant consideration with respect to whether a Chapter 13 case has been filed in bad faith is "whether 'the debtor only intended to defeat state court litigation." *Id.* at 1445-1446.

The Debtor's clear intent to forum shop is prima facie evidence of bad faith. Through his declaration, the Debtor states that he wants a different judge (i.e. one without knowledge of his prior bad acts in the State Arbitration Action), to rule on the appropriateness of the attorney's fees, costs, and interest in the case. Bankruptcy courts have regularly dismissed chapter 13 cases for just this sort of behavior. See, e.g., In re Eisen, 14 F.3d 469, 470-471 (9th Cir. 1994) (affirming dismissal of bankruptcy petition where the only purpose was to defeat state court litigation). See also In re Silberkraus, 253 B.R. 890, 905 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2000)("it constitutes bad faith to file 690244.1 JJ 3841.002

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

bankruptcy to impede, delay, forum shop, or obtain a tactical advantage regarding litigation ongoing in non-bankruptcy forum - whether that non-bankruptcy forum is a state court or a federal district court."). Furthermore, a review of the Debtor's chapter 13 plan shows that Reliable is the **only** creditor that will be affected by the Debtor's bankruptcy filing. As a result, relief from stay should be granted so that Reliable's claim can be liquidated.

III. AN ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM THE AUTOMATIC STAY WILL NOT PREJUDICE THE DEBTOR, BUT A DENIAL OF THE REQUESTED RELIEF WILL PREJUDICE MOVANT

Chau claims that Movant will not be prejudiced by an order denying relief because Reliable can participate in the claims adjudication process. This is simply untrue. The hardship on Movant in proceeding through the claims adjudication process is substantial. Reliable has already fully litigated the matter in arbitration, with only the issue of attorney's fees, costs, and interest remaining. Adding what will in effect be a new trial through the claims administration process, when an arbitration has already been conducted, is unreasonable, unfair, and is not a proper use of the bankruptcy courts. It is also a waste of court resources. The Arbitrator is already fully familiar with the case, and is also in the best position to determine the reasonableness of Movant's fee request in light of Chau's dilatory and obstructive behavior in the State Arbitration Action. Bringing the matter anew, before a court without this level of familiarity will result in a waste of resources as the Court and its staff bring themselves up to speed. In addition, as a newly contested matter, the Court will need to schedule hearings, which will drain even more time and resources.

In contrast, the Arbitrator is already familiar with the facts of the case and is ready to act. Once the briefs have been submitted, the Arbitrator will take the matter under submission and render a decision. After that decision has been made, Movant need only petition to certify the judgment to liquidate its claim. Once the claim has been liquidated, there will be no need for a claims adjudication process, as the liquidated amount will be binding. Thus, allowing Reliable to liquidate its claim will greatly assist this Court in connection with Chau's Chapter 13 case.

690244.1 JJ 3841.002

NIEVES DARLING & MAH, INC	301 NOKIH LANE A VENUE, / FLOOK PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101-1807 Tel (626) 440-5200 • Fax (626) 796-0107
---------------------------	---

Finally, there is no prejudice at all to the Debtor. To the extent the Debtor disagrees with
Reliable's fee request, he can express that disagreement in his opposition papers, which he will
need to prepare in any event. After submitting his opposition to Reliable's motion for attorney's
fees, the Debtor's role in the State Arbitration Action will be complete. If Chau is prepared to
effectively proceed with a full-trial in bankruptcy court, then there is no reason he would not be
able to file an opposition brief before the Arbitrator.

CONCLUSION IV.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Based upon the foregoing, Reliable respectfully submits that "cause" exists to lift the automatic stay. For these reasons, Reliable respectfully requests that its Motion be granted.

DATED: February 17, 2015

HUNT ORTMANN PALFFY NIEVES DARLING & MAH, INC.

/s/ John L. Jones II By: JOHN L. JONES II Attorneys for Reliable Design and Construction Inc.

690244.1 JJ 3841.002

PROOF OF SERVICE OF DOCUMENT

I am over the age o	f 18 and not a party to this bankru	otcy case or adversary proceeding. My business address is:
301 North Lake Ave	enue, 7th Floor, Pasadena, Califor	nia 91101-1807
A true and correct Forum)	copy of the foregoing documen	t entitled (specify): _Motion for Relief from Stay (Non-Bankruptcy
will be served or wa		bers in the form and manner required by LBR 5005-2(d); and (b) in
Orders and LBR, th 02/17/2015, I o	e foregoing document will be serv checked the CM/ECF docket for th	FELECTRONIC FILING (NEF): Pursuant to controlling General ed by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On (date) is bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the st to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses stated below:
		⊠ Service information continued on attached page
On (date)case or adversary prirst class, postage	proceeding by placing a true and c	ersons and/or entities at the last known addresses in this bankruptcy orrect copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the United States mail, Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that mailing to the lie document is filed.
		⊠ Service information continued on attached page
for each person or of served the following writing to such serv	entity served): Pursuant to F.R.Cig persons and/or entities by personice method), by facsimile transmis	HT MAIL, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OR EMAIL (state method v.P. 5 and/or controlling LBR, on (date) _02/17/2015, I hal delivery, overnight mail service, or (for those who consented in sion and/or email as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a lil to, the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the
Hon. Sandra R. Kle United Bankruptcy 255 East Temple S Los Angeles 90012	Court - Central District of California treet, Suite 1582	
		⊠ Service information continued on attached page
I declare under pen	alty of perjury under the laws of th	e United States that the foregoing is true and correct.
02/17/2015 Date	Natalie Urbino Printed Name	/s/ Natalie Urbino Signature

This form is mandatory. It has been approved for use by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California.

ADDITIONAL SERVICE INFORMATION:

By NEF

CHAPTER 13 TRUSTEE: Kathy A. Dockery (TR) - efiling@CH13LA.com

OFFICE OF THE U.S. TRUSTEE:

United States Trustee (LA) - ustpregion16.1a.ecf@usdoj.gov

ATTORNEY FOR DEBTOR: M Wayne Tucker - tucker@waynetuckerlaw.com

ATTORNEY FOR JP MORGAN CHASE BANK: Merdaud Jafarnia - bknotice@mccarthyholthus.com

By Overnight Mail

DEBTOR:

100 S Mockingbird Lane West Covina, CA 91706

ATTORNEY FOR DEBTOR:

M Wayne Tucker Orrock Popka Fortino Tucker & Dolen 1533 Spruce St, Ste 100 Riverside, CA 92507

OFFICE OF THE U.S. TRUSTEE:

United States Trustee (LA) 915 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1850 Los Angeles, CA 90017

CHAPTER 13 TRUSTEE:

Kathy A. Dockery 700 S. Flower Street, Suite 1950 Los Angeles, CA 90017